



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,734	11/13/2003	Kulvir Singh Bhogal	AUS920030636US1	2693

7590 04/11/2008
Darcell Walker
Suite 250
9301 Southwest Freeway
Houston, TX 77074

EXAMINER

DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/713,734	Applicant(s) BHO GAL ET AL.	
	Examiner JAMES J. DEBROW	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-14 and 23-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-14 and 23-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendments filed 15 Jan. 2008.

Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 23-31 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 23 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's response dated 15 Jan. 2008, Applicant amended claims 23-31; canceled claims 15 and 19; argued against all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morscheck et al. (Patent No.: 6,076,080; Filing Date Nov. 4, 1997) (hereinafter "Morscheck"), in view of Larcheveque et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0189708 A1; Filing Date: Mar. 28, 2003) (hereinafter "Larcheveque").

Regarding independent Claims 1 and 23, Morscheck discloses *a computer implemented method for selecting rules from a rules repository to validate information submitted on an electronic form comprising the steps of:*

a) creating a validation rules repository on a computer (col. 1 , lines 35-51;

Morscheck discloses a validation rules repository on a computer.).

b) in response to receiving a connection request, establishing a connection with the created rules repository (col. 1 , lines 52-65; col. 23 , lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Thus, in response to receiving a connection request, establishing a connection with the created rules repository.).

c) receiving a rule request (col. 1 , lines 52-65; col. 23 , lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Therefore Morscheck discloses receiving a rule request.).

d) receiving a validation rule description (col. 1 , lines 52-65; col. 23 , lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Therefore it would have been obvious that the step of *receiving a validation rule description* would occur during when comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules.).

e) searching the rules repository for rules matching the rule description (col. 1 , lines 52-65; col. 23 , lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Therefore it would have been obvious that the step of *searching the rules repository for rules matching the rule description* would occur during when comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules.).

f) determining whether there are any rules that match the validation rule description (col. 1 , lines 52-65; col. 23 , lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Thus determining whether there are any rules that match the validation rule description.).

Morscheck discloses an error log/error message, which provide instructions how to correct the error for each fields for which invalid data was detected. Morscheck does not expressly disclose:

g) sending a query to the user to create a new rule when no rule matches the validation rule description and storing the created rule in the rules repository; and

h) retrieving the selected rule from the rules repository for incorporation into the electronic form.

Larcheveque teaches:

g) sending a query to the user to create a new rule when no rule matches the validation rule description and storing the created rule in the rules repository (0035; 0041; 0072-0075; 0098-0102; Larcheveque teaches a real-time validation tool which alerts the user through an alert containing information, such as a dialog box in a pop-up window. The pop-up window has various options, one of which including an option to add a custom validation rule. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the displaying of the pop-up window is analogous to sending a query to the user.).

h) retrieving the selected rule from the rules repository for incorporation into the electronic form (0091; Larcheveque teaches the validation tool enables the developer to create custom rules by allowing the developer to choose from preset validation rules. Thus, retrieving the selected rule from the rules repository for incorporation into the electronic form.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claims 2 and 24, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described further comprising before said retrieving step (h), the*

step of displaying at least one rule from the rules repository in response to a rule request.

Larcheveque teaches *the method as described further comprising before said retrieving step (h), the step of displaying at least one rule from the rules repository in response to a rule request* (0107-0109; Larcheveque teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claims 3 and 25, Morscheck discloses *the method as described in claim 2 wherein said step (a) further comprises establishing a plurality of categories of rules and storing the rules in the plurality of categories according to rule type* (col. 25, lines 56-63; Morscheck discloses validation rules fall into two classes, the general validation rules and the specific product validation rule.).

Regarding dependent Claim 4, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described in claim 3 wherein rule categories comprise alphabet and number categories.*

Larcheveque teaches *wherein rule categories comprise alphabet and number categories* (0101-0105; Larcheveque teaches two categories of rules, preset custom

validation rules and script-based validation rules. Larcheveque also teaches many types of preset validation rules are available by the system, such as rules that require data entered to be a numbers or text.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claim 5, Morscheck discloses *the method as described in claim 3 wherein rule types comprise name, zip code, telephone number, city, state and address, and credit card number* (col. 8,lines 1-52; Morscheck discloses an order entry system which contains validations rules for validating customer information. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner concludes the customer information to include but not be limited to name, zip code, telephone number, city, state and address, and credit card number.).

Regarding dependent Claims 6 and 26, Morscheck discloses validations rules fall into two classes, the general validation rules and the specific product validation rules (col. 25,lines 56-63). Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described in claim 3 wherein said displaying step further comprises displaying a category of validation rules*.

Larcheveque teaches *displaying a category of validation rules* (0101-0105; 0107-

0109; Larcheveque teaches two categories of rules, preset custom validation rules and script-based validation rules. Larcheveque also teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claims 7 and 27, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described in claim 6 further comprising before said displaying step, the step of receiving the rule request containing an identification of a specific validation rules category.*

Larcheveque teaches *the step of receiving the rule request containing an identification of a specific validation rules category* (0101-0102; Larcheveque teaches the developer can choose to add a preset validation rule by selecting an add preset rule button or the developer can choose to add a script-based validation rule by selecting either of two events in an event box. Thus, Larcheveque teaches the step of receiving the rule request containing an identification of a specific validation rules category.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claim 8, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described in claim 7 wherein said displaying step further comprises displaying only rules from the identified validation rules category.*

Larcheveque teaches *displaying only rules from the identified validation rules category* (0101-0105; 0107-0109; Larcheveque teaches two categories of rules, preset custom validation rules and script-based validation rules. Larcheveque also teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claim 9, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described in claim 8 wherein said rule retrieval step further comprises receiving an identification of a rule in the specific validation rules category and retrieving the identified rule from the rules repository.*

Larcheveque teaches *displaying a category of validation rules* (0101-0105; 0107-0109; Larcheveque teaches the developer can choose to add a preset validation rule by selecting an add preset rule button or the developer can choose to add a script-based validation rule by selecting either of two events in an event box. Thus, Larcheveque teaches the step of receiving the rule request containing an identification of a specific

validation rules category. Larcheveque also teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claim 10, Morscheck discloses *the method as described in claim 1 wherein said step (h) further comprises the steps of:*

receiving a description of a desired rule (col. 1 , lines 52-65; col. 23 , lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Therefore it would have been obvious that the step of *receiving a validation rule description* would occur during when comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules.).

Morscheck does not expressly disclose *displaying all rules matching the rule description; and*

retrieving a rule selected from the displayed rules matching the rule description.

Larcheveque teaches *displaying all rules matching the rule description* (0095-0102; 0107-0109; Larcheveque teaches a real-time validation tool which allows the

developer to choose a validation rule from a list or preset validation rules or create validation rule for a data-entry field in an electronic form. Larcheveque further teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

retrieving a rule selected from the displayed rules matching the rule description (0095-0102; 0107-0109; Larcheveque teaches a real-time validation tool which allows the developer to choose a validation rule from a list or preset validation rules or create validation rule for a data-entry field in an electronic form. Larcheveque further teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claim 12, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of storing the newly created rule in the rule repository.*

Larcheveque teaches *the method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of storing the newly created rule in the rule repository* (0035; 0041; 0072-0075; 0098-0102; Larcheveque teaches a real-time validation tool which alerts the user through an alert containing information, such as a dialog box in a pop-up window. The pop-up window has various options, one of which including an option to add a custom validation rule. Thus, storing the newly created rule in the rule repository.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claim 13, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the method as described in claim 1 further comprising after said step (h), the step of incorporating the retrieved rule into the electronic form.*

Larcheveque teaches *the step of incorporating the retrieved rule into the electronic form* (0091; Larcheveque teaches the validation tool enables the developer to create custom rules by allowing the developer to choose from preset validation rules. Thus, retrieving the selected rule from the rules repository for incorporation into the electronic form.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claims 14 and 31, Morscheck discloses *the method wherein said incorporating step further comprises:*

identifying a field in the electronic form (col. 1 , line 52-col. 3 , lines 12;

Morscheck discloses an interface programmed to capture form design data

representative of a forms order entered at the interface. Thus, identifying a field in the electronic form.).

attaching the selected rule to the identified form field (col. 1 , line 52-col. 3 , lines 12; Morscheck discloses an validation engine, which is in communication with the form interface, wherein the form design data is compared to a set of validation rules.).

retrieving validation software for the attached rule (col. 1 , line 52-col. 3 , lines 12; Morscheck discloses an validation engine, which is in communication with the form interface, wherein the form design data is compared to a set of validation rules.).

Regarding dependent Claim 28, Morscheck discloses *the computer program product as described in claim 23 wherein said retrieving instructions (h) further comprise:*

instructions for receiving a description of a desired rule, the description containing the rule category (col.1, lines 52-65; col. 23, lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Therefore it would have been obvious that the step of *receiving a validation rule description* would occur during when comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules.).

instructions for searching the repository for rules matching the rule description (col.1, lines 52-65; col. 23, lines 53-67; Morscheck discloses the second computer is remote from the first computer and in communication with the first computer and is

programmed to validate the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules. Therefore it would have been obvious that the step of *receiving a validation rule description* would occur during when comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules.).

Morscheck does not expressly disclose *instructions for displaying all rules matching the rule description; and*
instructions for retrieving a rule selected from the displayed rules matching the rule description.

Larcheveque teaches *instructions for displaying all rules matching the rule description* (0095-0102; 0107-0109; Larcheveque teaches a real-time validation tool which allows the developer to choose a validation rule from a list or preset validation rules or create validation rule for a data-entry field in an electronic form. Larcheveque further teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

instructions for retrieving a rule selected from the displayed rules matching the rule description (0095-0102; 0107-0109; Larcheveque teaches a real-time validation tool which allows the developer to choose a validation rule from a list or preset validation rules or create validation rule for a data-entry field in an electronic form. Larcheveque further teaches displaying a list of preset validation rules through a prelist validation list.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

Regarding dependent Claim 29, this claim recites subject matter that is similar to Independent Claim 1. Therefore it is rejected based on the same rationale as given in Independent Claim 1.

Regarding dependent Claim 30, Morscheck does not expressly disclose *the computer program product as described in claim 23 further comprising after said retrieving instructions (h), instructions for incorporating the retrieved rule into the electronic form.*

Larcheveque teaches *instructions for incorporating the retrieved rule into the electronic form* (0091; Larcheveque teaches the validation tool enables the developer to create custom rules by allowing the developer to choose from preset validation rules. Thus, retrieving the selected rule from the rules repository for incorporation into the electronic form.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Morscheck with Larcheveque for the benefit of creating a real-time validation tool which notifies a user of an error as it is entered into a structured data file's electronic form. (0012).

NOTE

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 15 Jan. 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues *the design data in Morscheck is not a description of a rule, but is the specification for an order form. Any comparison step in Morscheck is to determine the forms order by comparing the form design data with a set of validation rules.*

(Remarks, p. 10)

The Examiner disagrees.

Without acquiescing the Applicant's argument, which the Examiner does not, the Examiner concludes the scope of the claimed limitation describes receiving data (description/specification) which is used to determine the existence of a validation rule which matches the description/specification. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation along with Applicant's rationale that Morscheck data is form design data, the Examiner determines that the specification data for an order form is validated/compared to with specific form information (*validation rules*) to meet the

requirements of the user (col. 6, lines 17-32). Therefore, Morscheck teaches receiving a validation rule description.

Applicant argues *although Larcheveque does provide the opportunity to create validation, unlike Applicants' present invention, this option in Larcheveque is not in response to a failed search for a rule as claimed in Applicants' present invention. Larcheveque fails to teach the step of sending a query to the user to create a new rule when no rule matches the validation rule description. Applicants submit that there is no suggestion or teaching to modify (combine) the references.* (Remarks, p. 10-11)

The Examiner disagrees.

Larcheveque teaches building validation rules for structures errors or a data-type error that stops a user from continuing to edit an electronic form if the real-time validation tool detects a structure error (0063-0066). With each piece of data received, the validation tool is capable of comparing the data received against an appropriate list of validation rules associated with the node/field the data received is intended. Larcheveque teaches a developer having the option to add a customer validation rule to the selected node/field by choosing from a preset list of validation rules or creating a validation rule by creating a script.

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g., a computer programmer who writes code for electronic form validation) would know that software for establishing validation

rules for an electronic form could have at least two options: 1) selecting a validation rule from a database of existing validation rules; or 2) creating a new rule and adding the new rule to the validation rules database.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100